



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## MASSORETIC STUDIES.

## IV.

*The Division into Verses (continued).*3. *The Division of Verses of the Massorah.*

IN the preceding investigations it was presumed that the division of verses of the Massorah was known, and that, with very few exceptions, it was identical with that of our editions of the Bible. This identity is, in the first instance, based upon tradition; for our editions flowed from MSS. in which the division of verses was marked. It is further based on the concurrence of the numbers of the verses of separate sections (Pentateuch), and of the sums of the verses of the separate books and of the three parts. That also the separate verses in respect to their magnitude, i.e. the division of verses, in a narrower sense, are the same in our copies as those which the Massorah hands down and demands, follows from the diversified statements about the "Pesukim," which can be verified by the "Pesukim" of our copies. It is for the purpose of establishing this assertion, and, at the same time, of illustrating what importance the Massoretes attached to the division and limitation of verses, and what amount of labour they consequently bestowed on them, that we will produce here a few characteristic data from the Massoretic material extant. For this object we shall make use of the *Massora marginalis* and *finalis*, such as Frensdorff's Massoretic works (*Ochlah We-Ochlah*, Hanover, 1864, and *Massoretisches Wörterbuch*, Hanover and Leipzig, 1876), and Ginsburg's *The Massorah* (3 parts). In the latter books the reader can find the further explanations of the data we produce, and, of course, a great number of other data on this point<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Vide particularly *Ochla*, Nos. 39, 164, 171-175, 179, 194, 225-230, 268, 274-282, 286-288, 296-300, 362-365, 374; *Massoretisches Wörterbuch*, pp. 373-381. The Massorah follows, on the whole, in its arrangement the *Masora finalis*; the above-mentioned book, the *Massoretisches Wörterbuch*, can therefore be used. It is rather more difficult, as we have done, to look out the needful passages from the Index to vol. II. But, having regard

We commence with the proofs for whole verses. There are three verses (Gen. ii. 5, Num. xxvi. 8, Josh. xi. 14) which number eighty letters (*Ochla*, No. 316, cf. *M. W. B.*, p. 377 b); three verses commence and terminate with ׀ (*Massora Exodus*, 29, 30; *M. W. B.*, p. 378 b; Ginsburg, ׀, No. 17). Eleven other verses begin and terminate with ׀ (Ginsburg, II, 1, No. 13=Lev. xiii. 9; Num. xxxii. 32, &c.). There are ten verses each word of which contains a ׀ (*Massora*, Num. xxvi. 24; *Mf.*, ׀, 8; Ginsburg, ׀, 18); the whole alphabet (Ginsburg, II, 277; *M. W. B.*, p. 381 b; for instance, Zeph. iii. 8: cf. *Minchat Shai*; Ezek. xxxviii. 12, &c.). Five verses have forty words each: Jer. xxxviii. 4, Dan. iii. 15, v. 23, Esther iii. 12 (*Massoret. Wörterbuch*, 380 and 381, No. 1). The fifth verse was unknown to Frensdorff; it is, as Ginsburg, II, 442, correctly states, Dan. vi. 13. Fourteen verses of the Pentateuch contain three words each (*Massora Exodus*, 28, 13, &c.; *Mf.* 7, 1; *M. W. B.*, p. 381, No. 4; Ginsburg, II, 439). Four verses have each seven words consisting of four letters (*Mp.*, Ps. lxxiii. 2, Prov. xvii. 3). Ps. cxix has four verses—namely, 15, 47, 113, and 146—having four words each (*Massora*, Ps. cxix. 47: *Mf.* 77, 17). So has Ps. cxix, verses 43 and 128, ten words each (*Mp.* cxix. 128). Seven verses have fifteen words each, of which the middle word, i.e. the eighth, form a Ketib and Keri: 1 Sam. xiii. 19, xxx. 24, Jer. xxxiii. 8, &c. (*Ochla*, No. 164). Eleven verses of the Torah begin and end with the same word, for instance, Lev. xxiii. 42 (*Massora*, Lev. vii. 19; *M. W. B.*, p. 381, No. 3). Ginsburg, II, 424, mentions, in accordance with the Massorah to Lev. vii. 19 cited by him, only ten, but in the index he correctly notes נ"ו. In other places, also, there are discrepancies between Ginsburg's text and the index, which were not noted by Baer in his review of Ginsburg's work in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, XL, 743 sqq. Cf. about the notation in question Ginsburg, III, p. 221 a, where thirty-three verses of that kind are adduced; also 1, 98. Three verses begin and terminate with the Tetragrammaton (Deut. xxxi. 3; *Mf.* 78, 50; *M. W. B.*, p. 338, *sub fin.*). We also refer briefly to several numbers of the *Ochla*, where various combinations of the same particle in one verse are noted: 230 (תן), 298–315 (כל), 317, 318 (ן), 321–324 (ע), 328–333 (ן), 334 (ם),

to the space at our disposal, we can only give a small fragment. After some study of the Massoretic material, the corresponding data can easily be found in these four collections. We, therefore, refer to this only occasionally. *Ochla* is the handiest of them, but contains, comparatively, the fewest data; which proves that, in the course of centuries, the Massoretic material has increased also in this respect. We do not especially cite Frensdorff's notes.

335-337 (שָׁמְרָה), 339 (חִנָּה), 340-342 (וְהוּא), 346 (אִם), 349-355 (עַל), 356 (גַּם), 362, in three verses of which לֹא occurs once, and וְלֹא occurs four times. These references occur also in Ginsburg's work and elsewhere, e.g. א, 517, in three verses of which, after אֵל, אֵל occurs four times, again followed by אֵל. This very small collection of data is sufficient to give an idea of the host of indications contained in the Massorah towards the fixing of the division of the verses.

A number of data give certainty about the COMMENCEMENT of verses: *Ochla*, Nos. 39, 171-175, 319, 320, 327, 338, 343, 345, 360, 368. In order to enable the reader to gain a correct idea of the amplitude of such data, I shall give a selection out of the less accessible work of Ginsburg, *and only such notes about the commencement of verses as are noted under א*: 88, Abraham commences a verse five times; 805, וַיֹּאמֶר ה' אֵלָיו three times; 1469, ה' אֵתָה three times; 869, וַיֹּאמֶר ה' אֵלָיו three times; 193, וְאֵלֶם five times; 340, וַיֹּאֲרֶה three times; 365, וַיֹּאֲרֶה three times; 418, אִשׁ ten times in the Pentateuch and twice in Job; 452, אֵת eight times (cf. 457); 650, אֱלֹהִים thirty-one times; 735, 736, אִם seventeen times in Exodus and seven times in Leviticus; 813, אֶמְרָה three times; 82, לֵאמֹר nine times; 957, וַאֲנִי thirty-three times; 1096, אֶרְצִי thirteen times; 1109, וְהָאֶרֶץ eight times; 1182, וַאֲשֶׁר twelve times. And to give a few more instances of other letters: ה, 93, וְהוּא thirty-three times; ו, 49, וַאֲתֹ seventeen times; י, 196, וְהָזֶה five times in Genesis; ע, 920, עָתָה twenty-five times.

On the MIDDLE OF VERSES (מַצְעוֹת פְּסוּקִים), see *Ochla*, Nos. 325, 326, 345, 346, 363; Ginsburg, א, 320, אֶחָדִי כֵן twice; 384, אֵין אֵין sixteen times (cf. *ibid.*, 387, 390, 394); ב, 370, יִשְׂרָאֵל fifteen times; ב, 250, וְכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל thirty-five times, &c.

On the TERMINATION OF VERSES (סוֹף פְּסוּקִים) see *Ochla*, Nos. 357, 268 (cf. *ibid.*, note); Ginsburg, א, 808, וַיֹּאמֶר ה' twenty times in the Prophets; 945, וַאֲנִי ה' twenty times in Leviticus; 949, אֱלֹהֵיכֶם, וַאֲנִי ה' seventeen times; 750, לֹא אִם seven times; ד, 147, לְרוּחֵיכֶם five times; ה, 255, הֵם twelve times; י, 123, וַיִּדְעֶמָּה כִּי אֲנִי ה' (in the index erroneously וַיִּדְעֶ) eleven times in Ezekiel.

It is noteworthy that the notes about the commencement of verses are considerably more numerous than those about the middle or termination of verses. We remind the reader of our previous observations as to the much greater significance attached, in the Talmud, to the commencement of verses than to their middle or termination. The latter is not mentioned at all, and for very good reasons. A knowledge of the beginning of the verses was useful in the schools and in the study of the Scriptures, because it called

to memory the whole verse, which could then be read correctly to the end. Thus it was allowed to arrange on Friday evenings the beginnings of the verses for children. But we do not hear anything about the terminations of verses, because these only gained a significance later, after the verses had not only received their limitations by accentuation, but had also become fixed for recitation by means of written signs. The Massoretic notes on the beginnings of verses, which are more natural intersections of the text than the terminations of verses, were, for the reasons stated above, already deemed worthy of attention in remote times, and therefore the number of such notes is greater. This becomes evident by a comparison of the data contained in *Ochla*, where the notes about the beginning of verses form by far the majority. The circumstance that *we* speak frequently of פסוק, and hardly ever of ראש פסוק, rests, as already mentioned, on our system of accentuation, which knows no ראש פסוק, but only a Silluk, usually called סוף פסוק. The alphabetical portions of Holy Writ prove that the beginnings of verses had already a significance in Biblical times: for the terminations of verses not even a rhyme exists.

The hosts of data contained in the Massorah make an accurate limitation of the individual verses possible; and thus the discrepancies are not numerous, either in the Massoretic works or in the editions. What we know about this, we have given in the previous chapter. *The result is, that Tradition, Massorah, and the Editions of the Bible are in perfect harmony on this point.*

#### 4. *Division into verses and Stichometry.*

The verses of classical antiquity differ essentially from those of the Alexandrine Bible. In secular writings, the "verses" served the purpose of fixing the remuneration of the copyists: they wrote lines of a certain length—thirty-six to thirty-eight letters to the line—without any attention being paid to the contents; but in Holy Writ the sections or lines were, at the same time, sections in reference to the contents. Every sentence formed a line, a *στίχος* or *versus*<sup>1</sup>. A פסוק can have, therefore, several verses (lines), as well as several קרא, כתוב, מקרא. We can identify *stichos* with דָּבָר, or, better still, with the טעמים of the Jerusalemite, or the פסקי טעמים of the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, p. 316 sqq.; E. König, *Einleitung in das alte Testament*, p. 462, and the works quoted in these books. We have made mention already, II, 1, of more recent works. It would be worth while to make a thorough comparative study of the division into verses and the Biblical *Stichometry*, and we recommend such study to those to whom the literature in question is accessible.

Babylonian Talmud. The question is whether the Hebrew Bible knew of *Stichoi*.

Hupfeld<sup>1</sup> answered this question in the affirmative in respect to the poetical pieces. We assent to this opinion, without, however, wishing to decide whether such sentences made a line each. We consider it as certain that such sentences formed a unity, and were recognized as such. People knew that the individual sentences in the poetical pieces, Exodus xv, Deut. xxxii, Judges v, and 2 Sam. xxii, were complete in themselves, and were reproduced also in writing in accordance with such limitation<sup>2</sup>.

Another question, which does not concern us here, is, how this limitation of individual sentences was expressed in writing. It is known that the three books of Psalms, Job, and Proverbs were, as late as the Middle Ages, written as שירה, although the linear representation in the MSS. is no longer the original one. It is, therefore, beyond doubt, that the Talmud, Kiddushin, 30a, when giving the number of the פסוקים of the Psalms as 5,896, means such *stichoi*<sup>3</sup>. Consequently, *the number of stichoi is found in the Talmud in the same manner as, on the other hand, the number of Massoretic verses in the non-Hebrew codices*. A distinction (mentioned also elsewhere) is found in Cod. Erlangen, 770, 8 *sub fin.*, which gives the number as 2,606: "Ter quinquagenos David canit ordine psalmos Versus bis mille sexcentos sex canit ille<sup>4</sup>." Still more remarkable is the account given in a fragment of the Psalms in the Royal Library in Copenhagen, in which the number of the verses of the Psalms is given as IIDXXVII. *This is the figure given by the Massorah*, which seems to have escaped Berger<sup>5</sup>. I am fortunate enough to be able to point out the Massoretic number of verses for the Pentateuch in a MS. of the Vulgate. For Exodus, Berger, p. 363, gives "*Mille ducenti et novem: compl.*"<sup>1</sup>, and this agrees with the Massorah to the letter<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Ausführliche hebr. Grammatik*, 1841, pp. 84-114, König, 461.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Megilla, 16 b, and Minchat Shai to Deut., c. 32.

<sup>3</sup> Luzzatto, *Hebrew Letters*, ed. Gräber, p. 346; Hupfeld, *Grammatik*, § 20; Delitzsch, *Psalms*, II, 398, 3rd edition; I, 21. Luzzatto, in accordance with Joel Brill's edition with commentary, really obtained the number 5,896, but not without some artifices. The Massorah counts in the Psalms only 2,527 verses. By adding the number of verses of the individual chapters, I get for the Peshitta 4,793; in Berger, p. 365, I find 5,000, and from MSS. of the Vulgate, 5,500.

<sup>4</sup> Delitzsch, *Psalms*, II, 398, the same is cited by Berger (p. 365), from B, No. 10,420.

<sup>5</sup> *Histoire de la Vulgate*, p. 365; for the description of the MS. in "Nouveau fonds royal," No. 1, vide *ibid.*, p. 380.

<sup>6</sup> For a description of the Codex Compl.<sup>1</sup>, vide Berger, p. 392. The

The same Codex gives for Genesis: *Mille* LXXXIII. This figure cannot possibly refer to *stichoi*, the numbers of which vary between 3,070 and 4,900 (Berger, p. 363). The Massoretic number of verses for Exodus being attested, it is not too hazardous to assume that for Genesis also the Massoretic figure was originally given, and we really obtain it if we substitute D for L=1,534. Three sets of figures of *stichoi* are preserved for Leviticus, namely, 2,300, 2,400, and 2,600,—tens and units are neglected. A fourth record gives MCCC (=1,300). This figure cannot possibly refer to *stichoi*. On the ground of the information given by the Massorah about the number of verses, and previously pointed out by me, I venture to conjecture, by the figure as given in this MS., which hails from the tenth century, and which, according to Berger, exhibits the Spanish text of the Vulgate, that the number of verses as given by the Massorah is meant. It is only necessary to put D instead of M,—DCCC=800, the figure given by the Massorah. As in the other codices, tens and units are neglected. The assumption that in Kiddushin, 30 a, the *stichoi* of the Psalms are given bears a high amount of probability. It is, therefore, plausible that figures giving the number of verses of the Chronicles, which is handed down together with that of the Psalms, also refers to the number of *stichoi*. The Chronicles have, according to the Talmud, 5,880 verses; the figure given by the Peshitta, which is of Jewish origin<sup>1</sup>, is only slightly less, namely, 5,630<sup>2</sup>.

The passage in the Talmud, frequently mentioned but not explained, is protected against far-reaching conjectures by the evidence of a Gaon. In the *Responsa of the Geonim*, edited by Harkavy (Berlin, 1885), No. 3 a, the question occurs how the sums of the verses of our

MS. is in the library of the Central University at Madrid, No. 31: "Première Bible d'Alcala: Nombreuses notes hébraïques en marge." The MS. hails from the ninth century. If it is possible to venture making a conjecture on the ground of the ample description (l. c., p. 22 sqq.), Jews must have had a part in the translation, or, at least, in the correction. Might not the Hebrew marginal notes be by Alfonso de Zamora, about whom Neubauer wrote in this REVIEW, VII, 398 sqq.?

<sup>1</sup> Rappoport, *Halichoth Kedem*, p. 16; Perles, *Meletemata Peschittoniana*.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Chron. 2,100. The figure given by the Peshitta refers, perhaps, to the Chronicles together with Ezra and Nehemiah; although 2,361 is given as the number of Ezra only (to which Nehemiah, of which no figure is given, probably belongs also). In reference to Proverbs, Peshitta (1,863) and Vulgate (MDCCCL=1,840) almost entirely concur, especially if XL is altered to IX. Rappoport's conjecture can be called a happy one in that particular point, that the Jews also occasionally used the word פסוקים in the sense of στίχοι.

Baraitha were to be understood, as they were contradictory to the facts. The Gaon answers: Your question is well-founded; we have quite different figures, namely, Torah 5,884, Psalms 2,524, Chronicles 1,970: the Baraitha refers to a Bible found in Jerusalem, which differed from other Bibles in respect to writing and number of verses. The three books in question have at present the afore-mentioned numbers<sup>1</sup>.

I shall give another conjecture on the *stichoi* in Jewish literature in the last note of the next chapter.

### 5. The number of verses of the Pentateuch<sup>2</sup>.

Before entering upon the question of the sum total of the verses of the Torah, we must first bring some order in the detailed information about the separate Sedarim, in which many variations show themselves. It is fortunate that, besides the Editions (=E), there are five lists at our disposal, which correct each other reciprocally. Four occur in Ginsburg's work,—ii. 450 sqq. (=A); iii. 6 sqq. (=B); iii. 269 sqq. (=D); iii. 301 sqq. (=F); and one in the *Manuel du lecteur*, pp. 111 sqq. (=C). The last (C) is identical with the first (A);

<sup>1</sup> The words in the Responsum read: יזה חוקשה לכם ודאי ולא האוי הכין תורה: המשת אלפים ושמונה ושמונים וארבעה פסוקי' וספר חילים שני אלפים וחמש מאות ועשרים וארבעה פסוקין. דברי ימים אלף וחשע מאות ושבעים אלא כך שמענו מפי חכמים הראשונים שאמרו בריתא הוה בספרים מסכתא (?) באותו ספר תורה שמצאו אותו בירושלים שהיה משונה בכתב ובמנין פסוקין שלו וכן ספר חילים וכן ספר דברי ימים אבל עשוי אין תורה אלא כך ואין חילים אלא כך ואין דברי ימים אלא כך. It is remarkable that the Gaon gives the Massoretic figure only for the Psalms. The variation 24 instead of 27 is easily explained by a corruption from 1 into 7, which was natural by the Arabic pronunciation of the Dzal, and which occurs elsewhere also. In the case of the number of verses of the Pentateuch ושמונים ושמונה וארבעים (= ושמונ' וארבע' וארבעה) is perhaps a corruption of 'ושמונ' וארבע' and which occurs elsewhere also. As we shall endeavour to show in the next chapter, the Pentateuch has 5,842 verses, if the Decalogue is reckoned for ten verses; but if the Gaon reckoned it for thirteen verses, he would obtain 5,848: but perhaps מ"ה was read instead of מ"ו. It is more difficult to reconcile the Gaon with the Massorah in reference to the verses of the Chronicles. The latter have, according to Ginsburg, II, p. 453 (1,765 V), אלף ושבע מאות וששים וחמשה; according to Norzi, ed. princeps (1,787), אלף ושבע מאות ושמונים ושבעה; according to Baer (*Orient*, XII, 262), 1,764. It is, therefore, probable that in the *Responsum* of the Gaon חשע מאות must be read instead of שבע מאות, so that only a surplus of five or six verses remains.

<sup>2</sup> This subject has been treated by Baer, *Orient*, XII, 202 sqq.; I. Derenbourg, *Manuel du lecteur*, note iv; Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, X (1872), 22 sqq.



we nevertheless reckon them for two, for three variations<sup>1</sup> seem to prove that Ginsburg had not taken that list from the *Manuel*. The Arabic list, B, accords with these, and is, in cases of difference, the most precise one. D and F belong together; both show the same corruptions, and differ only in two cases, which are obviously errors of the copyists<sup>2</sup>.

A comparison of all the lists, including those which are afforded by the editions of the Bible, show to demonstration that they flow, one and all, essentially from the same source, i. e. that they are all based upon the same numbering of verses. In by far the most cases they agree with each other, and their origin is obvious in spite of the comparatively few discrepancies. The latter are, for the most part, errors in copying or in reading, which are easily recognized and explained. A conclusive proof of the correctness of this assertion lies in the fact that the total sums of all are equal, without, however, even in one single list, according with the results offered by the detailed data. If we have here different methods of counting the verses, we must needs ascribe this harmony to the strangest possible errors of addition.

We shall now make such comparison for the purpose of proving the above proposition, and of fixing the correct figure for the number of verses, and for many sections of verses. We shall give *seriatim* the numbers of verses of our weekly portions—no tradition existing to my knowledge about the Palestinian Sedarim—according to A, and compare them with those of the other lists, and with what other data there are. No discrepancy is noted whenever all lists and all references concur. For the sake of brevity the names of the portions are not given<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> ארבעה וששים כו וסימן נדר, according to A, קדשים; C has the same note, only more correctly כו for כו. Ginsburg, strangely, marks נדר with a query, instead of כו. Now if he had taken his list from the *Manuel*, כו, which is protected by the query against misprint, would be unintelligible. ברר has, according to A, fifty-seven verses (= חשיל); according to C, שבעה וחמשים נר נר המנן חשיל. Here we should have to assume a tacit correction by Ginsburg, which is improbable in view of the previous example. שששים has, according to A, ninety-seven; according to C, ששה וחמשים צו נר המנן עבדיו צו. It is true צו=צו and ששה=ששה; nevertheless, a tacit correction cannot be assumed. This very capable Massorete will, perhaps, shortly give an account of his sources; for in that case only his work will be of real service to science.

<sup>2</sup> D has חורץ, 66, F 67 (כו=כו); כי חצא D 110, F 106 (ק=ק).

<sup>3</sup> For another comparison, vide Baer, *Orient*, XII, 205. Has not Baer coined several mnemonics himself?

Genesis:  $146 + 153 + 126 + 146 + 105 + 106 + 148 + 154 + 112 + 146 + 106 + 85$ . DF have 84 instead of 85 (Vayechi). Vayerah has in BE 147, which is the correct figure, for otherwise the sum total for Genesis would not be 1,534, as given everywhere, but only 1,533. קָמֹו was turned into קָמֹו, and afterwards the mnemonic יִחוּזְקִיָּהוּ was invented. Accordingly, B has another mnemonic, בִּוּנִיָּהוּ, which is correct. E, although giving here correctly 147, furnishes, nevertheless, 1,533 as the sum total of the book; for it gives only 153 as the number of וִישְׁלַח. A פִּסְקָא בְּאַחַד עֶשְׂרִי פָסוּק, Gen. xxxv. 22, was undoubtedly taken for two verses, which is not the case in our editions of the Bible<sup>1</sup>. The two verses do not belong together, and were only read as one to enable the reader to omit the first without its being noticed<sup>2</sup>. xxvii. 40 is given as the middle of the verses. The book numbers 767 verses up to this verse, if Vayera numbers 147 verses. This follows also from the note that Genesis numbers 1,000 verses up to xxxiv. 20 (*Man. d. l.* 149 and elsewhere): if Vayera had only 146 verses, there would only be 999. The figures are exclusive of xxvii. 40, resp. xxxiv. 20; this follows from the data on the next thousand, on which we shall have to dwell again.

Exodus:  $124 + 121 + 106 + 116 + 72 + 118 + 96 + 101 + 139 + 122 + 92$ . DF show the following corruptions: וְאֵרָא, 118 (D also 98); בּוֹא, 129 (D also correction, 106); פְּקוּדֵי, 96. The first error may be accounted for by erroneous addition,—118 instead of 121. The second error may have arisen in this way: that the fourth Palestinian סֵדֶר of בּוֹא was taken in full, i. e. twenty verses of בִּשְׁלַח (xiii. 17–xiv. 14) also; for BC first give the Palestinian Sedar of each week. This would produce כֹּמֶה וְעֶשְׂרִים וְשֵׁשׁ, which then became כֹּמֶה תִּשְׁעִים וְשֵׁשׁ = תִּשְׁעִים וְשֵׁשׁ, צב = צו. In the third instance וְעֶשְׂרִים וְשֵׁשׁ. The other sources produce identical figures. The main difficulty consists in this: how is the figure 1,209, which is universally handed down as the sum total, to be accounted for? The addition of the separate figures produces only 1,207. The half of the number of verses of the book is fixed at xxii. 27, exclusive (Ginsburg and *Manuel*); and up to that verse there are only 602 verses, and not 604 ( $= 1202$ ), whilst, as a matter of fact, there are 604 verses from xxii. 17 to the end. The two missing verses must therefore be looked for in the first half. Besides, according to the *Manuel* (p. 149), there are from Gen. xxxiv. 20 to Exod. xvii. 15 one thousand verses: this statement

<sup>1</sup> Cf. S. Baer, *Orient*, XII, 202, and Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 373.

<sup>2</sup> Mishna, Megilla, 25 a; Shabbat, 55 b. According to another interpretation of the Talmudical passage, which we gave above, the Talmud assumes here only one verse; but the Massorah numbers two, and explains the Talmudical passage in the way given here.

proves to be correct, both according to the separate verses and the editions. The two verses in question must therefore be looked for in chapters xviii-xxii. This closer limitation at once suggests the decalogue.

It is known that the decalogue can be divided into two sets of verses. If it is divided according to the commandments, we find ten verses; if no regard is had to the commandments, there are thirteen verses<sup>1</sup>. In the former case, the weekly portion, Jethro, has seventy-two verses, and seventy-five in the second case. The number of verses is, therefore, either one too many or two too few. The larger figure is usually adopted, and the number 1,209 upheld by the elimination of one verse<sup>2</sup>; but some correct the Massorah, e.g. S. J. Reggio<sup>3</sup>. The statement of the Massorah cannot be upheld, once the decalogue is held to contain thirteen verses. But we reject this mode of reconciling the two statements, and for an important reason. All lists agree in assigning to the weekly portion, Jethro, seventy-two verses; all of them have, therefore, divided the decalogue into ten verses. The decalogue in Deuteronomy is, in all lists, also stated to have ten verses; for they assign to Vaetchanan 119 verses, our editions numbering 122<sup>4</sup>. But if the decalogue is counted as ten verses, then two verses are missing from the sum total both of Exodus and Deuteronomy. Exodus would have 1,207 verses instead of 1,209, and Deuteronomy 953 instead of 955.

I believe I shall be able to trace the two missing verses in Exodus xix. 9 in accordance with Kiddushin, 30a. It is stated in this Talmudical passage that the Palestinians divided the verse in question into three

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W. Heidenheim's *Meor Enayim*, Appendix to Exodus. The stereotype edition erroneously counts sixteen verses, by dividing ch. xx. 13-16, על שֶׁר . . . לא תרצה, into four verses. This is admissible only when the division is made according to commandments, but in that case vv. 3-6 and 8-11 would be only one verse each. In Deut. v. 17 these commandments count correctly as one verse.

<sup>2</sup> Vide Baer, "Die Verszählung des Pentateuch," *Orient*, XII (1851), 200 sqq. A. Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, IV, 265 sq., takes xx. 2-3 as one verse. Cf. also, on the division of the verses of the decalogue, Geiger, *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie*, III (1837), 153, 463.

<sup>3</sup> Igroth Jaschar, p. 30.

<sup>4</sup> A proof that the decalogue was counted as ten verses can be found in Chizkiyah's words, according to which, the reason why in the synagogue no less than ten verses should be read, was in order to correspond to the ten commandments: חוקי אֱמֶר בְּנֵי עֶשֶׂר הַדְּבָרִים. (J. Taanith, 4, 3, fol. 68a at the bottom = J. Megilla, 4, 2, fol. 75a; cf. b. Meg., 21b, in the name of ר. יוסף.) It would have been remarkable if they had satisfied themselves with ten verses for the sake of a decalogue of thirteen verses.

verses; and as the same tradition assigns the origin of the fixing of the numbers of the verses to the Soferim, which would mean that it had come from the Palestinians to the Babylonians, there could not be anything remarkable in the circumstance that in fixing the figure 1,209, Exod. xix. 9 was counted as three verses. The Massoretic notes must be sifted according to their original sources. The sum total, 1,209, dates from time immemorial, and has its origin in Palestine; the detailed figure seventy-two is either of Babylonian origin, or has been changed from seventy-four after the Babylonian division of verses had already counted xix. 9 as one verse. The fact that several contradictory statements occur in the Massorah side by side is also proved by this, that two notes, quoted by Heidenheim, *Exodus*, p. 80b, contradict the division of the decalogue into ten verses.

As to the two missing verses in Deuteronomy, I believe that they must be looked for in Haäzinu, for in the lists F D, fifty-four verses, instead of fifty-two, are given as the number of that weekly portion. I do not venture to decide how these two verses are to be got at, but it is not impossible to do so, for this weekly portion contains several verses consisting of four parts. The middle verse of Deuteronomy is, according to the *Manuel*, p. 149, xvii. 10. According to the separate figures, the book numbers up to this passage only 475 verses, instead of the required number, 477 ( $=\frac{255}{2}$ ). But this information cannot be used as an argument against our assumption, for it is also contradictory to the assertion of the *Manuel* and the other lists, that Veatchanan numbered 119 verses. The designation of this middle verse is based on the decalogue being counted as thirteen verses, but is not quite correct even then, for a verse remains superfluous if the number is given exclusive of the middle verse, as is usually done.

Leviticus has  $111 + 97 + 91 + 67 + 90 + 80 + 64 + 124 + 57 + 78 = 859$  D F gives for צו, צו, which is a slip for צו; in the same way D has for תוריע, כו instead of כו. We have already noticed that in A, in קרושים, כו is an error for כו, just as in C, in בהר, חטיל for חטיל. D F have further, in עה, בחקתי instead of עה. The middle verse is xv. 7. This is correct, for up to this verse (exclusive) there are 429 verses  $= \frac{858}{2}$ . The note that Exod. xvii. 16 to Lev. xi. 7 contains a thousand verses is also correct. That בהר has fifty-seven verses and not fifty-four, a thing evident in itself, follows also from the note that the fourth thousand is contained in Lev. xi. 8 to Num. x. 16.

Numbers. The unanimous information of all sources produces:  $159 + 176 + 136 + 119 + 95 + 87 + 104 + 168 + 112 + 132 = 1,288$ . The middle verse is xvii. 20 (exclusive)  $= 644 = \frac{1288}{2}$ . The *Manuel* shows

1,289 verses, because there xxv. 19 and xxvi. 1 are taken as two verses each, although they are real cases פסוק באמצע פסוק. This is also shown by the note that Num. x. 17 to Deut. iii. 29 contain a thousand verses. פנחס must, therefore, have only 168 verses, and not 169, as correctly given by Heidenheim, and S. D. Luzzatto, *Il Pentateuco* (Padova, 1875).

Deuteronomy: 105 + 119 + 111 + 126 + 97 + 110 + 122 + 70 (נצבים וילך) + 52 + 41. We have already dwelt upon ואתחנן; also on D F, which give 127 in ראה, where קבו = קבו: on D, 106 in כי תצא = קו = קי (110), which is passed over by Ginsburg; on C in שפטים, where צו = צו; and on D F, in reference to האינו, 54. These figures give 953, and not 955 of the usual tradition. Everything that was required to be said on this point, as also on the middle verse, xvii. 10, has already been remarked above. Deuteronomy, from iv. 1 to the end, has 845 verses. Consequently, ואתחנן is counted as 122 and not 119 verses, and שפטים as 97 and not 96.

The whole of the Pentateuch contains, both according to the Massoretic works<sup>1</sup> and the editions<sup>2</sup>, 5,845 verses. The figure 5,835, which is twice met with in the Massorah of Tshufut-Kale<sup>3</sup>, is not an independent statement, but merely an error of the copyist; for it is not based on special detailed information, and is, moreover, in direct conflict with previous statements. It is frequent in the Massorah that numbers expressed by letters are easily corrupted, and that the erroneous statements that have thus arisen are further transmitted after having been transcribed in words. We have already given several instances of that kind in the course of these articles; in the present case מה היה was turned into מה ליה. We are convinced that there exists no rival information in the copies of the Massoretic notes. Our investigation leads to the conclusion that, in spite of the many discrepancies that these notes show, we may confidently assign all information of the Massorah referring to the number of verses in the Pentateuch to the same source.

<sup>1</sup> Ben Asher, *Dikduke Ha'amin*, p. 55; *Manuel du lecteur*, p. 179, h. D Ginsburg, *The Massorah*, II, p. 338 b, at the top; II, p. 452 b.

<sup>2</sup> E. g. Minchat Shai, ed. Mantua; W. Heidenheim, *Meor Enayim*, Rödelheim, 1818 sqq., and in the concluding Massoretic remark on the Torah. In Bomberg's Rabbinical Bible of 1526, and in Buxtorf's Bible of 1665, the figure 5,245 is the error either of the copyist or of the printer, for the addition of the separate numbers at the end of each book produces 5,845.

<sup>3</sup> Ginsburg's *Massorah*, III, 269 b and 301 b, at the end of the two lists D F discussed above. I cannot find any reason why Ginsburg should have printed twice the same list.

But the information given in b. Kiddushin, 30a, which states the number of verses in the Torah to be 5,888, seems to be of a different character<sup>1</sup>. It is not impossible that there was a time when forty-three more verses were counted in the Torah. There was, perhaps, another division of verses in the poetical portions of Exod. xv and Deut. xxxii, which produced forty-three additional verses. This figure could be arrived at from Heidenheim's two MSS. Heidenheim observes at the end of Deuteronomy, in the repeatedly-quoted edition, that the separate figures of the weekly portions amount to 992, and not to 955. Add this difference of thirty-seven to 5,845, and we obtain 5,882. For the sake of reconciling the two figures, we should have to read in Kiddushin, שמונים ושנים instead of שמונים ושמונה. But Baer (*Orient*, XII, p. 204, n. 3), and, after him, Geiger (*Jüd. Zeitschrift*, IV, 265) observe, that the separate figures in Heidenheim's MSS. were not correct; the harmony between the two figures is, therefore, merely accidental. It would be very peculiar indeed if the Tanna as well as the Massorete had first counted the total of נצבים וילך, and then again the verses of נצבים separately. The many "eights" in the Baraittha are suspicious from a Massoretic point of view. Otherwise we should be led to assume that 8,888 should be read instead of 5,888 (ח=ה), as Isaiah Berlin corrects Berachot, 7a. This figure would then be connected with another, which refers to the definition of the moments. A פסוק would certainly be too much for a רגע.

A third information is that of the Yalkut, i. 855, which gives 15,842 as the number of verses of the Pentateuch<sup>2</sup>. Rappoport wanted to conclude boldly from this passage that the Palestinians had divided most verses into three, and that the enormous figure had thus arisen<sup>3</sup>. But in all probability we have here only a wrong interpretation of the letter ה used as a figure. The words ה' אלפים were taken for 15,000<sup>4</sup>. We then should get the figure 5,842, which we consider

<sup>1</sup> ה"ר חמשת אלפים ושמונה מאות ושמונים פסוקים הוו פסוקי ספר תורה יתר עליו הלים שמונה חסר ממנו ר"ה שמונה.

<sup>2</sup> וחשבו פסוקים של תורה ט"ו אלפים וחמב.

<sup>3</sup> G. Pollak, *Halichot Kedem* (Amsterdam, 1846), p. 10. Cf. *supra*, c. 2, *sub fin.*, the refutation of that opinion.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. J. Müller, *Sopherim*, p. 135, n. 9. In the Massorah ה' is usually written, not ה; vide *Manuel*, 35, 7, 9; 37, 6; 126, 6; Ginsburg, *Massorah*, I, p. 234a at the commencement, p. 224b and 289b several times; also b. Menachot, 29b. Other instances, taken from the Talmuds, are found in Berliner, *Beiträge der Hebräischen Grammatik im Talmud und Midrash*, p. 19. From the Jerushalmi, the form ה' only is quoted there. In Ginsburg,

the most correct. In discussing the number of verses of the Pentateuch we have already endeavoured to prove that the decalogue counted only as ten verses. We conjectured that the missing two verses were contained in Exod. xix. 9. The number of verses of Deuteronomy seemed to be in conflict with that assertion, because it amounts to 955 only, if the decalogue counts as thirteen. But the Yalkut gives, as a matter of fact, only 5,842 (not 5,845), and the decalogue must, therefore, have been taken to contain only ten verses; and this, as we have seen, was really done in the detailed amount of Vaetchanan. It is noteworthy, also, that Levita, *Massoret Hammassoret*, III. Preface *sub fin.*, counts 5,842, and not 5,845. The exact Massoretic number of the verses of the Pentateuch may, therefore, be 5,842. The identity of the hundreds, tens, and units in Yalkut and Massorah goes to prove that the discrepancy in the thousands owes its origin to a corruption, provided that we have, in our editions, the original reading, and not a reading corrected in conformity with the Massorah<sup>1</sup>.

III, 70 a, ה"א occurs repeatedly. פ"י is also written like ה"י in *Manuel*, 35, 2; 39, 2, 7, and elsewhere. Ginsburg, II, 429, has פ"י only in the heading emanating from Ginsburg; the four notes cited there have ה"י. The mode of writing ה"א and פ"י is of a more recent date; and it seems to me that it was not used at all in ancient times.

<sup>1</sup> מדרש is given as the source of this Agada. This points to a younger Midrash, as Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, 302, note, observes. Since Simeon Kara, as Zunz assumed, and A. Epstein again proved in his treatise: ר' שמעון קרא והלכות שמעון (Cracow, 1891), lived in the thirteenth century, the Midrash in question must be very recent. It is not impossible that this Agada was taken from the collection of Midrashim of Moses Hadarshan, who embodied in his work also non-Jewish Agadas, and even such as are opposed to Jewish conceptions, as Epstein proved in his *Beiträgen zur jüdischen Alterthumskunde*, XI, *Moses ha-Darshan aus Narbone* (Vienna, 1891), p. 9, and *Revue des études juives*, XXI, p. 80 sqq. I am led to assume this, in the first place, by the calculation of the days of seventy years and of the two verses that fall to each year; the figure seventy and the Gematrias belonging to the favourites of Moses Hadarshan. In the second place, the mentioning of verses from the Apocrypha is most remarkable, לבר מספרי הדיוצונים; this can only have been done by Moses Hadarshan, who did not keep himself free from Christian conceptions. Nor is the computation of the seventy years according to the solar cycle Jewish. Add to all this the number of the eighteen ימי הדת, which do not accord with the number of the festival days of the Diaspora, and refer perhaps to the eighteen days on which the individual in *Palestine* could recite the complete Hallel (Taanith, 28 b, י"ח ימי הדת = י"ח ימי ההלל, for which reason the recitation of the two verses is omitted). All these considerations suggest the assumption that this Agada has issued from

Grätz (*Monatsschrift*, XXXIV, 97 sqq.), arguing from the number of verses as given in the Talmud and Yalkut, endeavoured to establish important discrepancies in reference to the division of verses. In this he looks for support also in the threefold information about the middle verse of the Torah, which is given in Kiddushin, 30 a, as Lev. xiii. 33; in Masechet Soferim, IX, 3 (ed. Müller, XVI) as Lev. viii. 23; and in the Massorah and *Dikduke Hat'amim*, p. 55, as Lev. viii. 8. Grätz argues that the first indication referred to the Babylonian, the second to the Palestinian, and the third to the Karaite division of verses, and that the latter had become solely and universally adopted. The three figures given as the sum total of the verses of the Pentateuch are explained by Grätz in the same way, namely, that 5,888 was the figure of the Babylonians, 15,842 that of the Palestinians, and 5,845 that of the Karaites. The Baraitha in Kiddushin, 30 a, which is introduced by the words חנו רבנן, must, in that case, be of *Babylonian* origin; further, in a division of verses which gives for the whole Pentateuch an overplus of forty-three verses only, and which, therefore, almost entirely agrees with ours, the middle verse must be moved forward by 152 verses (Lev. viii. 8 to xiii. 13), from which it would follow that they had made their verses longer than ours in the first half of the Pentateuch, and shorter in the second half. Nothing of this can be entertained. Grätz attaches too much importance to the expression בעלי מקרא, which he considers to refer, like בני מקרא, to the Karaites; but the expression is frequently enough applied in Talmud and Midrash to those who have a great knowledge of the Bible<sup>1</sup>. We can, however, in complete refutation of Grätz's assumption, adduce the numerous data, quoted from the Talmudim and Midrashim in the second chapter of this inquiry, which constitute irrefragable evidence for the division of verses as possessed by us. From these data, being partly of Babylonian and partly of Palestinian origin, there can be no doubt that, barring insignificant differences which can have no weight in deciding this question, essentially the

an extraneous, non-traditional source. If this be the case, the enormous number of verses, which according to this computation must be the result, can also be understood. For according to this calculation, there must be at least 41,160 verses; for seventy years have 20,580 weekdays, every day two new verses should be given to God = 41,160. The Hebrew Canon containing in round figures 23,000, the Apocrypha must supply the still missing 18,000. Or Moses Hadarshan counted the *stichoi* as Biblical verses; in that case the number of verses required can be accounted for. I believe that the enigmatical Agada could be solved after this method, although not strictly in the way indicated here.

<sup>1</sup> Erulim, 21 b; Baba Mezia, 33 b; Sanhedrin, 101 a, and elsewhere.



same division of verses existed in both countries. In the face of this fact we can dispense with all other, however obvious, refutations.

Turning to the question of the divergent information about the middle verse, the one given in the treatise Soferim, namely, Lev. viii. 23, can be explained in two ways. Up to Lev. viii. 8 there are 2,922 verses; the verse indicated as the middle verse belongs, therefore, neither to the first nor to the latter half, but stands between, for  $2,922 \times 2 = 5,844$ , and there are 5,845 verses. Now suppose a Massorete had in the Talmud the reading 5,882 (שנינים = שמונה), and considered this the correct number, either from having omitted to check it, or on the ground of a different numbering of the verses of Deut. xxxii, in that case he had to count till he reached the half of that figure,  $\frac{5882}{2} = 2,941$ . If he, further, took the decalogue to contain thirteen verses—a thing not at all impossible, considering what we said before on the subject—then on reaching Lev. viii. 8 he had 2,925 verses, and sixteen more verses brought him to Lev. viii. 23 = 2,941 verses. Another explanation would be this: that the abbreviation וי (= $\text{וישם}$ ), Lev. viii. 8, was turned into וישחט, Lev. viii. 23. The information about the middle verse as given in the Talmud is more difficult to explain. It cannot have been based upon an essentially different division of verses, for the very same Baraitha gives the sum of the verses of the Pentateuch as only forty-three verses more than that of the Massorah, but there are 152 verses between Lev. viii. 8 and xiii. 3. I admit I can propose nothing in explanation, except that the ancient Massorete made a mistake in counting, or that he failed to understand the note about the middle verse. It is also possible to conjecture that the big ל had been originally an indication of the middle letter, which indication was erroneously transmitted to the middle verse, the ל in לחן serving for this purpose. I do not attach much value to this conjecture; I give it merely as a suggestion.

#### 6. *The Number of Verses of the Prophets, the Hagiographa, and the whole Bible.*

The sums of the separate books of the Prophets and the Hagiographa are given, besides the editions, which cannot be relied on<sup>1</sup>, by Ginsburg, *B*, 195–215, and partly by Baer, *Orient*, XII, 262. We give here Ginsburg's list, and add Baer's variations in brackets. A "B" is added where both agree; where Baer has given no figure nothing is added.

<sup>1</sup> In the stereotype edition of the Bible Society the figure for the Chronicles is 1,656.

<i>Prophets.</i>		<i>Middle.</i>
Joshua	656 <sup>1</sup> .	xiii. 26.
Judges	618 <sup>1</sup> .	x. 8.
Samuel	1506.	I, xxviii. 24.
Kings	1536 B.	I, xxii. 6.
Isaiah	1292 <sup>1</sup> B.	xxxiii. 21.
Jeremiah	1365 <sup>2</sup> [1364]	xxviii. 11.
Ezekiel	1273 [1272] <sup>3</sup>	xxvi. 1.
XII Prophets	1050.	Micah iii. 12 <sup>4</sup> .
	<hr/> 9296	

In spite of the separate figures, the sum total is given by Ginsburg as 9,294; and by Baer, who has only two verses less, as 9,292 <sup>5</sup>. In another Massorah (Ginsburg, II, p. 338 at the top), the figure 9,298 occurs. *Dikduke Hat'amim* gives, in agreement with the first figure, 9,294. Isa. xvii. 3 is indicated as the half of the Prophets (חצי הנביאים), *Dikduke*, 56, Ginsburg, II, 338 a 6; this accords both with the figure 9,294 and the figure 9,296. In the former case xvii. 3 belongs to the second half, and in the latter case, to the first; for up to Isa. xvii. 3 there are 4,647 verses = 9,294 : 2. If 9,298 verses are counted, the two additional verses would be equally divided between the two halves, and the middle verse would remain the same.

<i>Hagiographa.</i>		<i>Middle.</i>
Psalms	2527	lxxviii. 36.
Proverbs	915 (914)	xvi. 18.
Job	1075	xxii. 16.
Song of Solomon	117	iv. 14.
Ruth	85	ii. 21.
Lamentations	154	iii. 34 (32 misprint).
Kohelet	222	vi. 10.
Esther	167 B	v. 7.
Daniel	357 B	vi. 12 <sup>6</sup> .
Ezra (Nehemiah)	688 (686)	iii. 32 <sup>7</sup> .
Chronicles	1765 (1764) <sup>8</sup>	I, xxvii. 25.
	<hr/> 8072	

<sup>1</sup> The same in Baer's edition.

<sup>2</sup> In the מסכתא : סמן the ם is a misprint for ן.

<sup>3</sup> Baer gives, in his edition of Ezekiel (Leipsic, 1884), the figure 1,273.

<sup>4 5 6 7 8</sup> For these notes see next page.

The sum total is not given by Ginsburg in this place, but is found 338 b, as 8,063; *Dikduke*, p. 55, has 8,064. This figure can be reconciled with the separate items only by subtracting five verses from Job, two from Ezra, and one each from Proverbs and the Chronicles; this would give 8,063. Was not Baer induced by the addition to subtract, against the Massorah, a verse each from Proverbs and Chronicles? The remaining eight or nine verses can only be accounted for by eliminating five verses from Job, two from Ezra, and one from Esther (according to Norzi). Psalm cxxx. 3 is marked as the middle verse of the Hagiographa (Ginsburg, 338 a, and *Dikduke*, 56). The sum total being 8,063, there must be 4,032 to Ps. cxxx. 4. The Chronicles and Psalms have  $1,765 + 2,527 = 4,292$ . From Ps. cxxx. 3 to the end of the book there are 259 verses; therefore  $4,292 - 259 = 4,033$ , which is not quite correct. A total of 8,064 must therefore be assumed, and Ps. cxxx. 3 must be counted to the second half<sup>1</sup>.

The sum total of the whole Bible amounts, according to Ginsburg, II, 453, and *Dikduke*, p. 55, to 23,203. This sum can only be arrived at by keeping, according to Ginsburg and against the separate figures

<sup>4</sup> Ginsburg, it is true, gives the same verses, but persistently gives in his reference of chapter and verse the one that precedes. For Joshua, cf. Minchat Shai. For Ezekiel, the second verse of ch. xxvi was given by Baer (*Orient*, XII, 262), but in his edition he notes xxvi. 1. Norzi always notes the middle verses, and they agree with those given.

<sup>5</sup> 9,292 being expressed in words (השנים ושנים), ח"ו צ"ר must be a misprint and not vice versa.

<sup>6</sup> Ginsburg, v, 29, וחציו בה גלילי קטל, but up to v. 30 there are only 167 verses. Norzi and Baer mark correctly vi. 12. Has Ginsburg obtained his reference from some MS.? The Bible, ed. Brescia, 1493, marks Ps. lxxviii. 38 as the middle of the book, as Berliner observes: *Ueber den Einfluss des ersten hebräischen Buchdrucks auf den Cultus und die Cultur der Juden*, p. 28. He could have added, that Kiddushin, 30 a, also marks this verse as middle verse. Cf. Norzi, end of צו.

<sup>7</sup> There are 343 up to this verse = 686 : 2. According to the figure 688, one verse must be sought before and one after the middle.

<sup>8</sup> Norzi has Proverbs and Ezra 915, 688 respectively, Esther 166, Chronicles 1,787. Job has, according to Norzi, and Baer in his edition, not 1,075, but 1,070. The latter figure is verified by the addition of the verses. In Baer, ch. 5, the number of the last verse is missing, but the section is indicated. Ginsburg's figure, which is protected against misprint by its repetition in letters אָלף, is consequently wrong. Whence has Baer 914 instead of 915, a figure already given in the Midrash? The same applies to Chronicles.

<sup>1</sup> For references on the Fourths of the Pentateuch and the Hagiographa, vide *Dikduke*, p. 56.

for the Prophets, to the traditional figure 9,294, and by supplying 8,064 for the Hagiographa. These figures are expressly preserved in *Dikduke*. Accordingly, 5,845 (Torah) + 9,224 (Prophets) + 8,064 (Hagiogr.) = 23,203. For the three divisions of Holy Writ, Ginsburg has, II, 338 b, the following figures: 5,845 + 9,298 + 8,063. This amounts to 23,206. Baer, *Orient*, XII, 262, gives 23,202, having adopted for the Hagiographa the figure 8,063. These differences can be explained. But the following formulae also occur:

(1) פסוקים שתי רבואות ושני אלפים ושבע מאות וארבעים ושבעה לא (1) פסוקים שתי רבואות ושני אלפים ושבע מאות וארבעים ושבעה לא (Ginsburg, II, 338).

(2) (תרתין רבון) ותרתין אלפין ושבע מאות וארבעין ושבעה וחכו.

(3) שתי רבוא ו ····· אלפים ושבע מאות וארבעים ושבעה לא יתר לא פחות.

(4) (שתי רבוא) ושלשה אלפים ושתי מאות וארבעים ושבע (4) (שתי רבוא) ושלשה אלפים ושתי מאות וארבעים ושבע (Dikduke, p. 56, note).

The identical introductory and concluding formula shows that we have to deal here with the same Massoretic note. On comparing these corrupted readings, we are struck by the fact that they have, besides the myriads, only the figure 47 in common. Although we are justified in considering the thousands and hundreds as errors of the copyists, we cannot do so with the figure 47. It would be incomprehensible indeed how נ could have become מ"ז, or שלשה have been turned into ארבעים ושבעה. It seems to me that we have here an intentional correction by an overwise copyist, who, instead of the Massoretic sum of verses of the Pentateuch (5,845), took that of the Talmud (5,888). Thus he obtained an overplus of forty-three verses, which added to 23,203 (4) gives 23,247. This different sum total is, therefore, the correction of the sum of the verses of the Pentateuch made by a copyist who had read the Talmud.

The Massoretic sum total is, however, the correct one. This is shown by the indicated middle verse of the whole Bible, which is Jer. vi. 7. There are, up to this verse, 5,845 (Pentateuch) + 5,608 (Joshua-Isaiah) + 149 (Jer. i. 1-vi. 6) = 11,602. This multiplied by two makes 23,204. It follows that the sum total of the Prophets is 9,296 (not 4), and the sum total of all the verses of the Bible is 23,205 (or 6). Without arithmetic one cannot find his way even in the Massorah.

We have described the history of the division into verses within the circle of Rabbinical Judaism, without entering upon the grounds upon which such divisions were based. The examination of its justification on internal grounds has been undertaken by the commentators, especially in respect to the poetical and prophetic. As to the prose writings, the Pentateuch only has been subjected to an investigation

from this point of view in the repeatedly-quoted essay by Friedmann (*Menora*, I), not reckoning occasional remarks by commentators. We do not wish to pronounce a judgment about this essay. We only express the wish that commentators may give their attention to this neglected branch of Biblical studies, in order to evolve the laws by which the division into verses are ruled. It may be advantageous to Exegesis, and may give many a clue or hint towards the elucidation of some obscure passages.

*Budapest.*

LUDWIG BLAU.